



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/628,993	07/28/2003	Mark A. Gohlke	019469.0233	7350
36275 7590 08/23/2007 O'KEEFE, EGAN, PETERMAN & ENDERS LLP 1101 CAPITAL OF TEXAS HIGHWAY SOUTH #C200 AUSTIN, TX 78746			EXAMINER NGUYEN, DANNY	
			ART UNIT 2836	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 08/23/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/628,993

Applicant(s)

GOHLKE, MARK A.

Examiner

Danny Nguyen

Art Unit

2836

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 May 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 19-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 19-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 5/31/2007 with respect to claims 1 and 16 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Objection. Applicant's arguments regarding to claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 19, the term "a load dump) already recited in the preamble of the claims 1 and 16. the following terms " a load dump" recited the above claims is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Therefore, the objections remain.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 16, 19 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 1, lines 4, 7, 9, the term "a load dump"-should be "the load dump".

Claims 3, 4, 6, 19, the term "a load dump" should be "the load dump".

Claim 16, lines 6, 10, 13, 21, the term "a load dump" should be "the load dump".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1, 3, 4, 16, 18, 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ruhnau (USPN 4,703,388).

Regarding claim 1, Ruhnau discloses a method for protecting a vehicle system from a load dump comprises sensing an input voltage pulse exceeding a first value (col. 2, lines 60-65), determining whether the voltage pulse is a load dump (when the repeated voltage surge pulses occurs, col. 3, 4, lines 57-12), disconnecting the system from power if the voltage pulse is the load dump (col. 4, lines 7-12), absorbing the voltage pulses if the voltage pulse is not the load dump (col. 3, lines 11-14).

Regarding claims 3, 18, Ruhnau discloses measuring time duration of the voltage puls4 (col. 4, lines 51-52).

Regarding claims 4, 19, Ruhnau discloses disconnecting the system if the time duration exceeds a second value (col. 4, lines 7-12).

Regarding claim 16, Ruhnau discloses a protection circuitry system (figure 2) for protecting a vehicle system from a load dump comprises a pulse detector (detector 5) operable to sense an input voltage pulse exceeding a first value (col. 2, lines 60-65); and determine whether the voltage pulse is a load dump (when the repeated voltage surge pulses occurs, col. 3, 4, lines 57-12), a series switch (11) coupled to the pulse detector, the series switch operable to disconnect the system from power if the voltage pulse is a load dump (col. 4, lines 7-12); and a load spike protector (3) coupled to the pulse detector, the load spike protector operable to absorb the voltage pulse if the voltage pulse is not a load dump (col. 3, lines 11-14).

Art Unit: 2836

4. Claims 1, 2, 16, 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Miller (USPN 4,835,416).

Regarding claim 1, Miller discloses a method for protecting a vehicle system from a load dump comprises sensing an input voltage pulse exceeding a first value (18V, col. 7, lines 8-12), determining whether the voltage pulse is a load dump (col. 7, lines 13-16), disconnecting the system from power if the voltage pulse is the load dump (col. 7, lines 48-59), absorbing the voltage pulses if the voltage pulse is not the load dump (col. 7, lines 35-40).

Regarding claims 2, 17, Miller discloses reconnecting the system with the power when the voltage pulse concludes (col. 7, lines 44-48).

Regarding claim 16, Miller discloses a protection circuitry system (figure 5) for protecting a vehicle system from a load dump comprises a pulse detector (detector S3) operable to sense an input voltage pulse exceeding a first value (18V, col. 7, lines 8-12); and determine whether the voltage pulse is a load dump (col. 7, lines 13-16), a series switch (20) coupled to the pulse detector, the series switch operable to disconnect the system from power if the voltage pulse is a load dump (col. 7, lines 48-59); and a load spike protector (26) coupled to the pulse detector, the load spike protector operable to absorb the voltage pulse if the voltage pulse is not a load dump (col. 7, lines 35-40).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 5, 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ruhnau. Ruhnau discloses the timer circuit (10) includes the delay with the second value, but does not disclose the second value comprising approximately 17 milliseconds as claimed. However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select the value of the Ruhnau's timer circuit to any desired value as long as it compatible with the requirements of other elements in the circuit in order to properly performs the circuit against load dump event. It has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272,205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

6. Claims 2, 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ruhnau in view of Miller. Ruhnau discloses all limitations of claims 1 and 16 as discussed above, but does not disclose reconnecting the system with power as claimed. Miller discloses a load dump protection circuit (figure 5) comprises reconnecting the system with the power when the voltage pulse concludes (col. 7, lines 44-48). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the load dump protection circuit of Ruhnau to incorporate reconnecting

the system with power when the voltage pulse concludes as disclosed by Miller in order to eliminate requirement of maintenance action by a human operator.

7. Claims 3, 4, 18, 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller in view of Ruhnau. Miller discloses all limitations of claims 1 and 16 as discussed above, but does not disclose measures a time duration of the voltage pulse as claimed. Ruhnau discloses a load dump protection circuit (figure 2) comprises a timer (10) measures a duration of voltage pulse when the voltage surge repeatedly occurs (col. 4, lines 1-12, lines 51-52). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the load dump protection circuit of Miller to incorporate timer as disclosed by Miller in order to prevent the circuit being damage from the repeated voltage surge.

8. Claims 6, 7, 21, 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ruhnau in view of Stringfellow (USPN 6,359,737). Ruhnau discloses all limitations of claims 1 and 16 as discussed above, but does not disclose a display circuit as claimed. Stringfellow discloses a vehicle system comprises a display unit (10 in figure 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the vehicle system of Ruhnau to incorporate with a display unit as disclosed by Stringfellow in order to provides vehicle operator with both data and night vision display.

9. Claims 8, 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ruhnau in view of Stringfellow, and Bloom et al (USPN 5,764,280). Ruhnau and

Art Unit: 2836

Stringfellow disclose all limitations of claims 6, 7, as discussed above, but do not disclose the display unit is coupled to a global positioning system as claimed. Bloom discloses a vehicle comprises a display unit is coupled to a GPS system (col. 1, lines 27-47). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the display unit in vehicle system of Glehr and Stringfellow to incorporate with a GPS system as disclosed by Bloom in order to allow drivers to track vehicle's position with high accuracy.

Conclusion

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Danny Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-2054. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-4:30 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, MICHAEL SHERRY can be reached on 571-272-2084. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

DN

DN
8/7/2007

Stephen W. Jackson
8-20-07

STEPHEN W. JACKSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER